

## 1999 Challenger Session Industry Evaluation

### Ratings:

5.0 –	15	Highly Satisfied
4.5 –	1	
4.0 –	15	
3.5 –	2	
3.0 –	2	
2.0 –	0	
1.0 –	0	Highly Dissatisfied

Total: 35 responses, 28% of 126 industry attendees (total attendance, with FAA, 177)

Mean rating: 4.36 (Median and mode were 4.0)



### Comments by question:

#### 1. Why this rating?

- This was an organized, disciplined, effective meeting in which FAA received and responded to industry concerns; all USG agencies should work this well.
- Afternoon session was superb! Very effective to have the Administrator there answering and posing questions.
- It was a great interchange. Very helpful to our leadership in the future.
- Very interactive combination of small groups and plenary.
- Excellent forum.
- Well organized, I appreciated having the open forum to discuss FAA's performance and recommended objectives (more discussion of space would make it a 5!)
- We actually ended with action items.
- FAA was a good facilitator and listener.
- Good overview.
- Good reach for customer input.
- Good organization, continuous focus.
- The organization of the two groups facilitated more involvement, more input, & more energy from the table discussions than in past years.
- Well-run, good discussion, candid discussion.
- Good forum of discussion, but not enough participants understand the FAA...tend to oversimplify the answers to difficult problems.
- Good planning, organization for materials and participation.
- Organized to maximize ideas.
- The meeting was focused on the right things and came up with concrete results.

- Time too short.
  - Better format than last year, more time for input, much better organized.
  - Great interaction between all participants.
  - Focused, fair, stimulating, accessible, thoughtful, well organized, concise, and “challenging”...also inclusive.
  - A very efficient and productive process that will (hopefully) give the FAA some valid and timely feedback which will help it (and its managers) continue their successes.
  - Well organized. Good methods for collecting input & having discussion. Much better than previous Challenger Sessions.
  - This is a great forum. I was a little dissatisfied with the translation of the morning recommendations into slides presented during the afternoon.
  - Developed specific goals.
  - Very worthwhile to hear differing views from FAA and industry.
2. The highlight and the most significant part of the conference for me was:
- Ability to put space industry concerns out for the rest of the agency and industry to see, and vice versa. Got a great perspective as to how we (space) fit in, and hope that we were able to make FAA/industry more aware of us.
  - Collective focus & consistency of industry groups in terms of their perceptions.
  - Working group session & after lunch interchange.
  - The open exchange in the afternoon and the participation of management.
  - Interchange & communication – an opportunity to raise & clarify issues/priorities.
  - Open discussion between industry & FAA.
  - FAA’s receptivity to industry input.
  - Spring 2000 effort.
  - Morning workshop – provided all the comments are grouped and recorded.
  - Recognition of Congresses role.
  - Commitment shown by the FAA to address customer concerns and needs. I think we are on track.
  - Advanced preparation was obvious and commanded early confidence in the Challenger Session’s organization & credibility. (2) Outstanding format -- which lead to -- effective interaction.
  - Format & content.
  - The large amount of information that is processed so effectively. The chance to see my other aviation colleagues & the FAA in one setting with continuous dialogue. Jane is the first Administrator who ever committed her whole day to the session. That kind of behavior is exactly why she is highly thought of by the industry.
  - Open discussion in afternoon session.
  - Q&A in afternoon.
  - Brainstorming/breakout sessions. Hearing diverse perspectives.
  - Open discussion.
  - FAA/industry give & take and consensus for action.
  - Good to hear industry wants to help rather than criticize.
  - The 3 give backs.

- Feedback & commitment session after lunch.
  - Garvey remarks.
  - Commitment from Administrator and FAA management in the process.
  - The dramatic format change was really positive over last year. The panel process in 1998 just didn't work, but this did.
  - Commitments from FAA & industry. Breakout workshops worked well.
  - Concluded with a consensus follow through plan...with commitments.
  - Consensus that FAA had finally begun to operate as an integrated "system" and not a fragmented series of independent "stovepipes" that were primarily concerned with surviving as a bureaucratic unit.
  - Workshop on system efficiency – considerable consensus on what's good, what's bad, and potential solutions.
  - Seems to be strong industry consensus. The FAA is getting good guidance.
  - Recognition by FAA on areas that need change.
  - Understanding industry's perception of FAA activities.
  - Excellent dialogue – recommendations for specific actions now must take place.
3. If I could have changed anything about the conference, it would have been:
- Have it other than right after Thanksgiving.
  - Have industry list the things they think FAA might stop doing to reduce pressure against limited FAA funding levels.
  - A simple chart showing what the major themes were in the 1998 Challenger Session & what FAA did in 1999 in response & what are the results. Categorize all issues & new things to do as identified in the 1999 session & compare to present FAA strategies/plans & cross-correlate. Identify do-differents for the high priority items where necessary, and document results for next year. Show on one sheet matrix.
  - Not sure we focused on the two/three areas in the breakout. Seems we all came up with the same themes.
  - To have more airline representation in the 2 focus groups.
  - The Safety/Security workshop ended with a summary just before lunch and that same exact summary was reiterated after lunch. There is no need to repeat a summary – just do it once at the plenary.
  - Treat aerospace on equivalent basis as aviation – both are critical elements of National Transportation System infrastructure.
  - Have Congress here. Not to dominate but to listen! More diversity at the tables.
  - Separate the FAA functions (ATC, regulation, etc). The subject matter is too broad. Deal with service provider issues one day and airports or regulation another day.
  - Make sure tables breakouts are compatible. Make sure both sides of the aisle are here.
  - Have a special report available from last year's Challenger. Next year, we should compare issues raised in 1999 to accomplishments of 2000.
  - Shorter afternoon session.

- The morning seemed to be an exercise of re-stating what most industry insiders already know. As discussed during afternoon, let's get to execution/implementation. We seem to suffer from paralysis of analysis.
- Started too early in AM.
- More root cause analysis by the FAA of why they are falling short of industry expectations...maybe work on solutions to these items.
- Agenda commitment list for 2001 process including "must" items as well as discussion of items/projects that should be discretionary or contingent on funding approval levels.
- Don't put all interests at the same table. "Space" got too much exposure.
- Start at 0900 and end at 4PM. Have follow-up meeting to show industry where our input is put into the strategic plan for the FAA.
- Slightly smaller group of people – perhaps limit # from each organization or business.
- Nothing to change.
- I would highly recommend using this same process at the next Challenger Session – and that FAA spend 10 minutes or so summarizing the status of the previous (1999/2000) Challenger inputs & the impact of those inputs.
- Shorter.
- The Regional Administrators could have been spread around better in the breakout sessions. A number of RAs have FS or certificate backgrounds and should have been in safety/security session.
- If RAs are asked to be in attendance – disperse them with industry rather than isolating them.

#### 4. Other comments?

- Great facilities.
- In 2000 use the information from the 1999 Challenger Session.
- Great job! Jane came across very well.
- We should have a report card from last year to this, showing the resolution of industry concerns.
- I look forward to seeing an FAA "action item" summary soon & measuring progress towards fulfillment at next year's session.
- Industry is ready, willing, and able to help move initiatives forward.
- Appreciate everyone's candor & willingness to participate (both FAA and industry).
- Good job!
- Thanks!
- Cannot possibly understand how the UK-NATS representative was considered for attendance as a "stakeholder". I cannot imagine the reverse – "ugly Americans" in the UK-CAA strategic planning session. Perhaps there were others from foreign countries or industries – and even a few foreign airlines would have been acceptable, since they are 'customers' – but NATS?
- Stick with the "plan" in partnership mode! AND...get the President to emphasize importance!

- It is really good to see consistent leadership at FAA – Jane is clearly a cooperative manager & has finally been able to put her management team in place & focus on industry & national problems and not just FAA internal problems/issues.
- Overall, very well done. Served the purpose of “educating” industry as well as providing feedback.